

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 26, 2009. Claims 14 to 17 are pending in the application, of which Claims 14, 16 and 17 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 8 and 10 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead) in view of U.S. 5,930,467 (Morita) and U.S. 2003/0088518 (Kirk). As Claims 1, 8 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Turning to specific claim language, Claim 14 is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a server device and a printer. The apparatus includes: cache memory constructed to cache image data transmitted to the printer; a first storage unit constructed to store a cache list of the image data cached in the cache memory; a designation unit constructed to designate image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device; a second storage unit constructed to store a print list of the image data to be printed; a comparison unit constructed to compare the cache list and the print list; a download unit constructed to download the image data which is in the print list but not in the cache list; a deletion unit constructed to delete from the cache memory the image data which is in the cache list but not in the print list; and a transmission unit constructed to transmit the image data to be printed to the printer.

By way of example and not of limitation, Applicant submits that the following portions of the specification support the present claims as indicated. The cache memory of the

claims corresponds to the print cache area 110 as described on page 9, lines 9 to 13. The first storage unit of the claims corresponds to the second cache list information 111 as described on page 9, lines 14 to 17. The designation unit corresponds to print setting button 902 as described on page 12, lines 18 to 21. The second storage unit corresponds to the first cache list information 109 as described on page 9, lines 4 to 8. The comparison unit of the claims corresponds to plug-in 107 as described on page 14, lines 1 to 6. The download unit of the claims corresponds to plug-in 107 as described on page 14, lines 19 to 20. The deletion unit corresponds to the plug-in 107 as described on page 18, lines 5 to 18. The transmission unit of the claims corresponds to the plug-in 107 as described at page 15, lines 7 to 9. The updater of the claims corresponds to the plug-in 107 as described on page 15, lines 20 to 26.

According to the present invention as described in Claim 14, image data transmitted to the printer is cached in cache memory, and if any of the image data is not designated to be printed in the next printing operation, then such image data is deleted from the cache memory. In this manner, when the same image data is to be printed consecutively, the image data is read out from the cache memory and transmitted to the printer, and thus it is possible to reduce the load and time of repeatedly downloading the same image data from the server. In addition, the image data which is not to be printed is promptly deleted from the cache memory, which prevents the cache memory from being occupied with image data which is not used.

In contrast to the present invention, Holmstead merely discloses that the printer 100 deletes a print job after a predetermined period has elapsed. As admitted in the Office Action, Holmstead is silent about deleting cached image data when the image data is not designated to be printed in the next print job.

The Office Action further stated that the deleted job after, e.g., 30 days, can be a job that is not designated to be printed at the time the job reaches a certain age, and therefore an effect of deleting information from the local memory is performed. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such a characterization of Holmstead. In the case when the next print job is performed, e.g., 40 days after the previous job is performed, an apparatus in accordance with Holmstead deletes the job because 30 days has already passed. On the contrary, according to the present invention, if the image data is both in the cache list and the print list, the image data is not deleted, regardless of the number days the image data may have spent in the cache. Thus, as the obtained results are different between the present invention and Holmstead, it is obvious that the deletion operation performed in Holmstead and the present invention are not the same.

Applicant has reviewed the remaining references and submits that nothing in the remaining references is seen to cure the deficiencies of Holmstead. In particular, Morita discloses updating the FAT of a HDD and Kirk discloses that a plug-in controls a printing function of the Web browser. However, neither reference discloses or suggests caching image data to be printed in the information processing apparatus and deleting image data which is in the cache memory and not designated to be printed consecutively.

In light of the deficiencies of Holmstead, Morita and Kirk as discussed above, Applicant submits that Claim 14 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 16 and 17 are directed to a method and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 16 and 17 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS_WS 3781033v1